UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/600,994 | 06/19/2003 | Damon Larson | 47361.2.1 | 5796 |

22859 7590 04/18/2005

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.
200 SOUTH SIXTH STREET
SUITE 4000
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| ROSEN, NICHOLAS D | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 3625 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/600,994 | LARSON, DAMON | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Nicholas D. Rosen | 3625 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 August 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 June 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/17/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-39 have been examined.

### *Drawings*

The drawings are objected to because Figure 11 is a flow chart showing merely boxes with numbers, with no indication of what the boxes mean, and what is taking place. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Objections*

Claims 25 and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the sixth line of claim 25, "the stored data" lacks proper antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 27 and 28 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the sixth line of claim 27, "the stored data" lacks proper antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-24**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0088496) in view of official notice. As per claim 1, Piotrowski discloses a shopping system comprising: a scanner adapted to scan one or more product tags (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9 and 10); a processing device accessible to a network, the processing device operatively coupled to the scanner (paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, and 21); a server on the network adapted to receive the transferred data (the service nodes 110; Figure 1, and paragraphs 9, 16, 19, 28, and 36).; Piotrowski does

not expressly disclose a client application installed on the processing device (unless the software programs of paragraph 36 inherently include an appropriate application, which is arguable), the client application adapted to read scanned data from the scanner and to transfer the data over the network, but official notice is taken that it is well known for processing devices to have client applications. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for such a client application to be installed on the processing device, for the obvious advantage of enabling the processing device to carry out its described functions. Similarly, Piotrowski does not expressly disclose a server application configured to run on the server, the server application adapted to route the transferred data to one or more retailer network sites, but does disclose contacting retailer network sites (paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, 28), and, as above, application programs are well known, making the server application obvious for the advantage of enabling the system to carry out its described functions.

As per claim 2, Piotrowski discloses a wireless and handheld mechanism (paragraphs 20 and 21).

As per claim 4, the scanner in Piotrowski's system must be adapted to decode the scanned product tags to carry out its disclosed functions. Piotrowski does not expressly disclose storing the values within memory, but official notice is taken that it is well known to store data in memory; arguably, at least temporary storage would be necessary to transmit the data, as Piotrowski discloses. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of

applicant's invention to store the values in memory, for such obvious advantages as being able to resend the data should there be any difficulty transmitting the data to the server, and maintaining the data for future efforts to find the cheapest vendors of desired products.

As per claim 5, Piotrowski discloses that the product tags can comprise barcodes (paragraphs 9 and 20).

As per claim 6, Piotrowski discloses that the processing device can comprise a personal computer (paragraph 21).

As per claim 7, Piotrowski discloses that the processing device can comprise wireless telephone (paragraph 21), and discloses a cellular interface (paragraphs 20 and 27), which would make the wireless telephone a cell phone.

As per claim 8, Piotrowski discloses that the processing device comprises a personal digital assistant (paragraphs 20 and 21).

As per claims 9, 10, and 11, Piotrowski discloses that the network comprises an inter-network, a public network, and the Internet (paragraphs 16 and 19).

As per claim 12, Piotrowski discloses that the server can comprise a website (paragraphs 15 and 19).

As per claim 13, Piotrowski does not expressly disclose that the server comprises a database adapted for storing the transferred data (although the server in Piotrowski does comprise a database; paragraph 31). However, the server in Piotrowski would necessarily store the transferred data in order to carry out its

described functions (paragraphs 9, 16, 19, 28, and 36), implying a database in which the data are stored.

As per claim 14, Piotrowski does not expressly disclose that the client application is adapted to be activated manually by a consumer through the processing device, but official notice is taken that it is well known for client applications to be activated manually by a user through a processing device (e.g., by pressing a button, clicking on an icon, etc.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the client application to be adapted to be activated manually by a consumer through the processing device, for the obvious advantage of causing the client application to be activated when desired.

As per claim 16, Piotrowski does not disclose that the client application is adapted to create a secure network connection between the processing device and the server, but official notice is taken that secure network connections are well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the client application to be adapted to create a secure network connection, for the obvious advantage of preventing private data from being intercepted.

As per claim 17, Piotrowski discloses that data is transferred (e.g., paragraph 20), from which creating one or more streams of data to transfer is inherent.

As per claim 18, Piotrowski discloses the use of XML (paragraphs 22-24), implying that data streams are formatted using it.

As per claim 24, Piotrowski discloses the server transferring data to one or more retailer network sites (paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, 28), which implies an appropriate server controller configured to facilitate the transfer, since servers and other computers do not operate without programming.

Claims 3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski and official notice as applied to claims 2 and 1, respectively, above, and further in view of Mulla et al. (U.S. Patent 6,311,896). As per claim 3, Piotrowski does not disclose that the scanner is adapted to be removable from a downloading cradle that is operatively connected to the processing device, but Mulla teaches a scanner adapted to be removable from a downloading cradle that is operatively connected to a processing device (Figures 1, 2, and 3; column 3, line 37, through column 4, line 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the scanner to be adapted to be removable from a downloading cradle that is operatively connected to the processing device, for the stated advantage of providing a scanner/reader that is easy to use (column 3, lines 26-30).

As per claim 15, Piotrowski does not disclose that the client application is adapted to be activated automatically through the coupling of the scanner to the processing device, but Mulla teaches activating a downloading of data from a scanner based on detecting that the scanner is coupled to the appropriate processing device (Figures 1, 2, and 3; column 3, line 37, through column 4, line 4; column 10, lines 19-23). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic

commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the client application to be adapted to be activated automatically through the coupling of the scanner to the processing device, for the obvious advantage of sparing a user the trouble of taking additional action to activate the client application.

Claims 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski and official notice as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of the anonymous article "Sabre Simplifies Rental Car Shopping W/Geosearch Feature," hereinafter "Sabre." As per claim 19, Piotrowski discloses that the data includes scanned data (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, and 28), and discloses profiles associated with users (paragraph 31), which would be pointless without customer data differentiation data to indicate which user or scanner/processor data was coming from. Piotrowski does not disclose that the data includes client application parameters, but, first, this can be considered non-functional descriptive material, since claim 19 does not recite any use of the client application parameters, and, secondly, "Sabre" teaches client application parameters (especially paragraph beginning "Using the tool"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the streams of data to include client application parameters, for the stated advantage of including or excluding specific vendors as may be desired by a user.

As per claim 20, Piotrowski discloses the server receiving and interpreting data (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 19, 28, 31, and 36).

As per claim 21, Piotrowski does not disclose that the server is adapted to determine if the scanned data is specific to the one or more retailers based on the client application parameters, but "Sabre" teaches determining whether data is specific to one or more retailers based on client application parameters (the teaching of inputting client application parameters, as by including or excluding specific car vendors, is held to imply making the determination, in order to return results accordingly).

As per claim 22, storing the data is obvious over Piotrowski, as set forth above in rejecting claim 13, and Piotrowski implies doing this with no teaching that the scanned data is specific to one or more retailers; in Piotrowski, the data is apparently not specific to any one retailers, but used to find alternative retailers for products that are widely available.

As per claim 23, "Sabre" teaches a "comprehensive rate shop and booking tool" (paragraph beginning "Sabre Cars is a"), implying that the data is routed to appropriate retailers to check rates and, if desired, book auto rentals; the choice of retailer sites can apparently depend on including or excluding specific vendors in the client application parameters. Thus, it is obvious for the server to route the one or more streams of data to one or more retailer network sites, for the obvious advantage of attempting to do business with retailers likely to have the desired product, or otherwise to be compatible with the customer's desires, rather than with retailers who are not.

**Claims 25 and 26**

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0088496) in view of official

notice. As per claim 25, Piotrowski discloses a shopping system comprising: means for reading and storing one or more product tags (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9 and 10); a processing device accessible to a network, the processing device operatively coupled to the means (paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, and 21); a server on the network adapted to receive the transferred data (the service nodes 110; Figure 1, and paragraphs 9, 16, 19, 28, and 36). Piotrowski does not expressly disclose a client application installed on the processing device (unless the software programs of paragraph 36 inherently include an appropriate application, which is arguable), the client application adapted to read stored data acquired from the scanning means and to transfer the data over the network, but official notice is taken that it is well known for processing devices to have client applications. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for such a client application to be installed on the processing device, for the obvious advantage of enabling the processing device to carry out its described functions. Similarly, Piotrowski does not expressly disclose a server application configured to run on the server, the server application adapted to route the transferred data to one or more retailer network sites, but does disclose contacting retailer network sites (paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, 28), and, as above, application programs are well known, and obvious for the purpose of enabling the system to carry out its described functions, making the server application obvious.

As per claim 26, Piotrowski discloses that the means comprises a scanner (paragraph 9).

**Claims 27 and 28**

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0088496) in view of official notice. As per claim 27, Piotrowski discloses a shopping system comprising: means for reading and storing one or more product tags, the means being accessible to a network (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9 and 10); and a server on the network adapted to receive the transferred data (the service nodes 110; Figure 1, and paragraphs 9, 16, 19, 28, and 36). Piotrowski does not expressly disclose client and server applications, but (as above, with regard to claim 25) official notice is taken that applications are well known, and Piotrowski does disclose transferring data over the network to the server and contacting retailer network sites through the server (paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, 28), which also implies reading the data. Hence, as with claim 25, applications are well known, and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention, for the obvious advantage of enabling the system to carry out its described functions, making the server application obvious.

As per claim 26, Piotrowski discloses that the means comprises a scanner (paragraph 9).

**Claims 29-39**

Claims 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0088496) in view of official notice. As per claim 29, Piotrowski discloses a method of shopping comprising: scanning one or more product tags using a scanner (Abstract; paragraphs

8, 9, 10, and 20); coupling the scanner to a processing device accessible to a network (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, and 28; Figure 1); transferring the scanned data to a server over the network (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, and 28; Figure 1); and transferring the scanned data to one or more retailer network sites from the server (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, and 28; Figure 1). Piotrowski does not expressly disclose that the transferring steps are done using a client application and a server application, but official notice is taken that applications are well known (and note the software programs of paragraph 36). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the transfers to be carried out using appropriate client and server applications, for the obvious advantage of enabling the system of Piotrowski to carry out its described functions.

As per claim 30, the step of scanning in Piotrowski's system must involve decoding the scanned product tags for Piotrowski's system carry out its disclosed functions. Piotrowski does not expressly disclose storing the values within memory, but official notice is taken that it is well known to store data in memory; arguably, at least temporary storage would be necessary to transmit the data, as Piotrowski discloses. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to store the values in memory, for such obvious advantages as being able to resend the data should there be any difficulty transmitting the data to the server, and maintaining the data for future efforts to find the cheapest vendors of desired products.

As per claim 32, Piotrowski does not expressly disclose activating the client application manually by a consumer through the processing device, but official notice is taken that it is well known for client applications to be activated manually by a user through a processing device (e.g., by pressing a button, clicking on an icon, etc.). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the client application to be activated manually by a consumer through the processing device, for the obvious advantage of causing the client application to be activated when desired.

As per claim 33, Piotrowski does not disclose creating a secure network connection between the processing device and the server, but official notice is taken that secure network connections are well known. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to create such a secure network connection, for the obvious advantage of preventing private data from being intercepted.

As per claim 34, Piotrowski discloses that data is transferred (e.g., paragraph 20), from which creating one or more streams of data to transfer is inherent.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski and official notice as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Mulla et al. (U.S. Patent 6,311,896). Piotrowski does not disclose that coupling the scanner to a processing device comprising connecting the scanner to a downloading cradle that is connected to the processing device, but Mulla teaches coupling a scanner to a processing device by connecting the scanner to a downloading cradle that is coupled to

a processing device (Figures 1, 2, and 3; column 3, line 37, through column 4, line 4; column 10, lines 19-23). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to thus connect the scanner, for the stated advantage of providing a scanner/reader that is easy to use (column 3, lines 26-30).

Claims 35, 36, 37, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piotrowski and official notice as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of the anonymous article "Sabre Simplifies Rental Car Shopping W/Geosearch Feature," hereinafter "Sabre." As per claim 35, Piotrowski discloses that the data includes scanned data (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, and 28), and discloses profiles associated with users (paragraph 31), which would be pointless without customer data differentiation data to indicate which user or scanner/processor data was coming from. Piotrowski does not disclose that the data includes client application parameters, but, first, this can be considered non-functional descriptive material, since claim 35 does not recite any use of the client application parameters, and, secondly, "Sabre" teaches client application parameters (especially paragraph beginning "Using the tool"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the streams of data to include client application parameters, for the stated advantage of including or excluding specific vendors as may be desired by a user.

As per claim 36, Piotrowski discloses interpreting data to use it (Abstract; paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 19, 28, 31, and 36).

As per claim 37, Piotrowski does not disclose that the server is adapted to determine if the scanned data is specific to the one or more retailers based on the client application parameters, but "Sabre" teaches determining whether data is specific to one or more retailers based on client application parameters (the teaching of inputting client application parameters, as by including or excluding specific car vendors, is held to imply making the determination, in order to return results accordingly).

As per claim 38, storing the data is obvious over Piotrowski, as set forth above in rejecting claim 13, and Piotrowski implies doing this with no teaching that the scanned data is specific to one or more retailers; in Piotrowski, the data is apparently not specific to any one retailers, but used to find alternative retailers for products that are widely available.

As per claim 39, "Sabre" teaches a "comprehensive rate shop and booking tool" (paragraph beginning "Sabre Cars is a"), implying that the data is routed to appropriate retailers to check rates and, if desired, book auto rentals; the choice of retailer sites can apparently depend on including or excluding specific vendors in the client application parameters. Thus, it is obvious for the server to route the one or more streams of data to one or more retailer network sites, for the obvious advantage of attempting to do business with retailers likely to have the desired product, or otherwise to be compatible with the customer's desires, rather than with retailers who are not.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cameron et al. (U.S. Patent 6,202,062) disclose a system for creating a filtered information summary (and involving scanning barcodes). Wan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,766,947) disclose a real world showroom, involving scanning tags.

Schena (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/003177) disclose printed medium-activated interactive communication. Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0011233) discloses a coding system for linking physical items and corresponding online information. Engel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0002504) disclose a mobile shopping assistant system and device. Attia (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0016750) discloses a system and method for scan-based input, storage, and retrieval of information over a network. Miller et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0026357) disclose a system and method for targeting a promotion based on a user-input product identifier. Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0062260) disclose a system for placing orders. Siegel et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0082931) disclose a method and system for performing electronic retailing. O'Hagan et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0165778) disclose a notification system for customers using mobile computers in retail establishments. Perkowski (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0009392) discloses an Internet-based consumer product brand marketing communication system.

Hudetz et al. (WO 97/01137) disclose a system for using an article of commerce to access a remote computer. Williams et al. (WO 99/16060) disclose an embedded multimedia control code method and apparatus.

Pereira ("Electronic Configuration on Tap") discloses a search engine that identifies components based on vendors and other information. Majer ("License to Bill" [Abstract only]) discloses a portable phone with a wireless modem and a stylus for scanning barcodes, and finding the lowest price for an item over the Internet. The anonymous article, "JP Systems, BarPoint.com to Debut Wireless In-Store Comparison Shopping on Handheld Devices," discloses scanning barcodes and accessing a server for comparative pricing, etc. Lockwood ("Advertisement for Myself") discloses using a Palm Pilot to scan a bar code and find a cheaper price. The anonymous article, "NYSE Symbol: SBL," discloses a bar code-enabled Internet device. Tillett ("'Wormholes' Speed Web Buys" [Abstract only]) discloses making purchases on the Web by scanning bar-codes. The anonymous article, "Fall Internet World Exhibitor Profiles A to Z, Part 7 of 9," dsicloses a product-specific search engine with data linked to product barcodes. The anonymous article, "Connect2 Launched, Enabled by AirClic," discloses scanning a bar code to find relevant information and merchants.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 703-305-0753. The examiner's telephone number is scheduled to be changed too 571-272-6762 on or about April 13, 2005. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins, can be reached on 703-308-1344. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 703-746-5574.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas D. Rosen

NICHOLAS D. ROSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

March 29, 2005